

**REMARKS**

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-24 will remain pending in this application. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added by the present amendment.

In the January 4, 2007 Office Action, Claims 13-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by WO 00/59150 (“Peinado”). Applicants respectfully traverse all outstanding rejections.

***Interview Summary***

Applicants’ undersigned representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner Beemnet Dada participated in a telephonic interview on March 5, 2007 to discuss the above claim amendments. Examiner Dada stated that the above claim amendments appeared to overcome the rejections of record.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101***

Claims 43-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. In particular, the Office Action alleges that independent claims 13 and 19 may pertain to information embodied on a signal or carrier wave. Applicants respectfully traverse and submit that independent claims 13 and 19 are hereby amended to recite tangible storage mediums. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejections are respectfully requested.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by WO 00/59150 (“Peinado”). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 recite that, in response to receiving and recognizing protected content, a license for the protected content is obtained from an RM server. The obtaining is performed in an automatic manner without first receiving an explicit request to obtain the license.

Peinado discloses that a license may be obtained to decrypt and access protected content. However, Peinado explicitly discloses that the license is obtain in response to a license request (Peinado, Pg. 32, l. 6). Thus, for example, in Peinado's system, a user presumably has to spend the time to review a document and to determine that the document includes protected content. Additionally, for example, if a network connection has expired before the user can review the document, then it may not even be possible to obtain the license at the time the license request is received.

Accordingly, Peinado does not teach or suggest "such obtaining being performed in an automatic manner without first receiving an explicit request to obtain the license," as recited in independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 7, 13 and 19 are not anticipated by Peinado. Applicants further submit that claims 2-6, 8-12, 14-18 and 20-24 are patentable at least be reason of their dependency. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections are respectfully requested.

**DOCKET NO.:** 302766.1 / MSFT-2154  
**Application No.:** 10/607,896  
**Office Action Dated:** January 4, 2007

**PATENT**

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: April 4, 2007

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439